

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**  
**No. 23-2051V**

PATRICIA CRAVOTTA,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 24, 2025

*Michael G. McLaren, Black McLaren Jones Ryland & Griffie, P.C., Memphis, TN, for Petitioner.*

*Sarah Black Rifkin, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

**DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

On November 30, 2023, Patricia Cravotta filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration as a result of a tetanus-diphtheria-acellular pertussis vaccine she received on September 7, 2022, in her left shoulder. Petition, ECF No. 1. On October 29, 2024, I issued a decision awarding compensation to Petitioner based on the parties' stipulation. ECF No. 27.

---

<sup>1</sup>Because this Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, requesting an award of \$40,676.36 (representing \$36,749.80 in fees plus \$3,926.56 in costs). Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Motion") filed January 31, 2025. ECF No. 32. Furthermore, Petitioner filed a signed statement representing that no personal out-of-pocket expenses were incurred. ECF No. 32-3.

Respondent reacted to the motion on February 14, 2025, indicating that he is satisfied the statutory requirements for an award of attorneys' fees and costs are met in this case but deferring resolution of the amount to be awarded to my discretion. Motion at 2-4, ECF No. 33. Petitioner filed no reply thereafter.

I have reviewed the billing records submitted with Petitioner's requests and find a reduction in the amount of fees and costs to be awarded appropriate, for the reasons listed below.

### ANALYSIS

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs for successful claimants. Section 15(e). Counsel must submit fee requests that include contemporaneous and specific billing records indicating the service performed, the number of hours expended on the service, and the name of the person performing the service. *See Savin v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 85 Fed. Cl. 313, 316-18 (2008). Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are "excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary." *Saxton v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). It is "well within the special master's discretion to reduce the hours to a number that, in [her] experience and judgment, [is] reasonable for the work done." *Id.* at 1522. Furthermore, the special master may reduce a fee request *sua sponte*, apart from objections raised by respondent and without providing a petitioner notice and opportunity to respond. *See Sabella v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 209 (2009). A special master need not engage in a line-by-line analysis of petitioner's fee application when reducing fees. *Broekelschen v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 102 Fed. Cl. 719, 729 (2011).

The petitioner "bears the burden of establishing the hours expended, the rates charged, and the expenses incurred." *Wasson v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 24 Cl. Ct. 482, 484 (1991). The Petitioner "should present adequate proof [of the attorney's fees and costs sought] at the time of the submission." *Wasson*, 24 Cl. Ct. at 484 n.1. Petitioner's counsel "should make a good faith effort to exclude from a fee request hours

that are excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, just as a lawyer in private practice ethically is obligated to exclude such hours from his fee submission.” *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 434.

### ATTORNEY FEES

The hourly rates requested by attorneys and paralegals who performed work in this matter for all time billed through 2025, are reasonable and consistent with prior determinations and shall be awarded. Respondent offered no specific objection to the rates or amounts sought. ECF No. 33.

### ATTORNEY COSTS

Petitioner has also requested a total of \$3,926.56 in litigation costs and has provided supporting documentation to substantiate such costs. ECF No. 32-2. Such costs are associated with obtaining medical records, the Court’s filing fee, postage costs and travel expenses. I have reviewed the requested costs and find the majority of them to be reasonable - with the exception of certain travel expenses incurred by Attorney Webb.

Like attorneys’ fees, a request for reimbursement of attorneys’ costs must be reasonable. *Perreira v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 27 Fed. Cl. 29, 34 (Fed. Cl. 1992). The billing records reveal that attorney Webb traveled from Memphis to New York for an in-person meeting with Petitioner on January 23, 2024. Mr. Webb stayed for two nights at The Ritz Carlton New York, a luxury hotel. ECF No. 32-2 at 43. And requests reimbursement of \$1,865.06 for the two nights stay at the luxury hotel including meals and a meeting room reservation. It appears that the nightly room charge at the Ritz was \$684.27 including sales and city taxes. *Id.* at 43. This amount exceeds the federal government’s daily lodging rates for a hotel stay in New York City, which was \$169.00 per night in January 2024.<sup>3</sup>

While travel costs related to the Vaccine Claim are generally compensable, excessive costs claimed for upgraded methods of transportation, extravagant meals and luxury hotels are not. Accordingly, I find the total amount claimed for the luxury hotel stay

---

<sup>3</sup> See GSA FY 2024 Per Diem Rates for New York City at <https://www.gsa.gov/travel/plan-book/per-diem-rates>.

to be excessive and shall be reduced by *fifty percent*. **Application of the foregoing reduces the amount of costs to be awarded by \$932.53.**<sup>4</sup>

### CONCLUSION

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs for successful claimants. Section 15(e). Accordingly, I hereby GRANT, in part, Petitioner's Motion for attorney's fees and costs. **Petitioner is awarded attorneys' fees and costs in the total amount of \$39,743.83 (representing \$36,749.80 in fees plus \$2,994.03 in costs) to be paid through an ACH deposit to Petitioner's counsel's IOLTA account for prompt disbursement.** In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in accordance with this decision.<sup>5</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**  
Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master

---

<sup>4</sup> This amount reflects a fifty percent reduction of the luxury hotel costs and is calculated as follows:  $(\$1865.06 \times 0.50) = \$932.53$ .

<sup>5</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.